### DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

# Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

IN THE MATTER OF:

EB DOCKET NO. 03-152

WILLIAM L. ZAWILA, et al.

SEP II II 02 M TO

ORIGINAL

DATE OF HEARING: SEPTEMBER 9, 2003

VOLUME: 1

PLACE OF HEARING: WASHINGTON, D.C.

PAGES: 1-37

**NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.** 

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N W WASHINGTON, D C 20005

(202) 234-4433

www nealrgross com

# Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of: EB Docket No. 03-152 WILLIAM L. ZAWILA Facility ID No. 72672 Permittee of FM Station KNGS, Coalinga, California AVENAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC. Facility ID No. 3365 Permittee of FM Station KAAX Avenal, California | Facility ID CENTRAL VALLEY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, No. 9993 INC. Permittee of FM Station KAJP, Firebaugh, California | Facility ID H.L. CHARLES D/B/A FORD CITY No. 22030 BROADCASTING Permittee of FM Station KZPE, Ford City, California Facility ID LINDA WARE D/B/A LINDSAY No. 37725 BROADCASTING Licensee of FM Station KZPO, Lindsay, California In re Application of | File No. WESTERN PACIFIC BROADCASTING, INC. ∥ BR-19970804YJ For Renewal of License for Facility ID ∥ No. 71936 AM Station KKFO,

September 9, 2003

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N W WASHINGTON, D C 20005-3701

Coalinga, California

The pre-hearing conference came to order in Room TW-A363 of the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m.

Before: THE HONORABLE ARTHUR I. STEINBERG

#### APPEARANCES.

On Behalf of William Zawila; Avenal Educational Services, Inc.; Central Valley Educational Services, Inc.; H.L. Charles D/B/A Ford City Broadcasting; Linda Ware D/B/A Lindsay Broadcasting; and Western Pacific Broadcasting, Inc.:

SHELLEY SADOWSKY, Esq.

of: KWZ Rosenman

1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.

East Lobby, Suite 700

Washington, D,C. 20007-5201

(202) 625-3719

### On Behalf of the Chief Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission:

JAMES W. SHOOK, Esq.;

DAVID M. JANAS, Esq.; and

WILLIAM FREEDMAN, Esq.

of: Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

(202) 418-1420

#### ALSO PRESENT:

HARRY F. COLE, Esq.

SUSAN A. MARSHALL, Esq.

#### I-N-D-E-X

						Ρá	age	e N	Ο.
Appearances entered		•				•			6
Motion for Time Extension	•							•	8
Scheduling									9

Hearing Began: 9:40 a.m. Hearing Ended: 10:25 a.m.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2

1

(9:40 a.m.)

We're on the record.

3

4

5

This is a pre-hearing conference in EB Docket Number 03-152, which was designated the hearing by order to show cause, notice of opportunity for hearing, and

JUDGE STEINBERG:

6 7

hearing designation order FCC03-158, released July 16,

8

2003.

9

Twenty-five separate issues were specified

10 for the hearing. Without going into the details, the

issues seek to inquire into whether William L. Zawila

12 | -- that's Z-A-W-I-L-A -- misrepresented facts to or

lacked candor with the Commission, whether Mr. Zawila

and/or others assumed control over the real parties

and interests in certain stations and applications,

whether Mr. Zawila and/or others operated certain

stations substantially at variance from the terms of

their authorizations, and whether Mr. Zawila and/or

others committed other legal and technical violations

of the Commission's rules.

Ultimately the issues require a

determination as to whether certain authorizations

22

21

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	should be revoked and whether a license renewal
2	application should be denied.
3	In addition, the order to show cause
4	authorized the imposition of a forfeiture on Mr.
5	Zawıla and/or the permittees and licensees ınvolved in
6	this proceeding.
7	By order FCC03M-28, released July 21,
8	2003, the chief administrative law judge assigned this
9	case to me and scheduled the initial pre-hearing
10	conference for this morning.
11	Let me first take the appearances for the
12	parties. For William L. Zawila?
13	MS. SADOWSKY: Shelley Sadowsky, Katten
14	Muchin Zavis Rosenman.
15	JUDGE STEINBERG: For Avenal Educational
16	Services, Incorporated?
17	MS. SADOWSKY: Shelley Sadowsky.
18	JUDGE STEINBERG: For Central Valley
19	Educational Services, Incorporated?
<b>2</b> 0	MS. SADOWSKY: Shelley Sadowsky.
21	JUDGE STEINBERG: For H.L. Charles, doing
22	business as Ford City Broadcasting?

1	MS SADOWSKY: Shelley Sadowsky.
2	JUDGE STEINBERG: For Linda Ware, doing
3	business as Lindsay Broadcasting?
4	MS. SADOWSKY: Shelley Sadowsky.
5	JUDGE STEINBERG: And for Western Pacific
6	Broadcasting, Incorporated?
7	MS. SADOWSKY: Shelley Sadowsky.
8	JUDGE STEINBERG: For the Chief
9	Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission?
<b>-</b> 0	MR. SHOOK: James Shook.
11	MR. JANAS: And David Janas.
12	JUDGE STEINBERG: Let me go through the
13	pending pleadings. I have a couple of pleadings
14	pending. One is a petition for leave to intervene
15	filed on August 27, 2003 by Richard B. Smith. Mr.
16	Smith is represented by Vincent Curtis, Jr.; Harry F.
17	Cole; and Susan A. Marshall.
18	Mr. Cole and Ms. Marshall are in the
19	hearing room this morning, but since they're not
20	parties to this proceeding, I am not going to ask them
21	to enter an appearance. But I would like to note that
22	they're here today.

1	MR. COLE. Thank you, Your Honor,
2	JUDGE STEINBERG: Maybe I will let you
3	talk later, maybe I won't.
4	MR. COLE: We would appreciate the
5	opportunity.
6	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. The second thing
7	I have was filed yesterday, September 8, 2003, by Mr.
8	Zawıla, et al. And it's a motion for extension of
9	time within which to respond to the petition for leave
10	to intervene. Mr. Zawila requests that the time be
11	extended with which to file an opposition to the
12	petition, which would extend it to September 10th. Is
13	that correct, Ms. Sadowsky?
14	MS. SADOWSKY: That is correct, Your
15	Honor.
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: Is there any objection
17	to a granting of the motion? Mr. Cole?
18	MR. COLE: Not on behalf of Richard Smith,
19	Your Honor
20	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Mr. Shook?
21	MR. SHOOK: No, Your Honor.
22	JUDGE STEINBERG: The extension and

appellant request is granted. The responses to the 1 petition for leave to intervene will be due September 2 3 10th. And that goes for the bureau's response also. MS. SADOWSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. Also pending are five 5 JUDGE STEINBERG: sets of requests, requests for admission of facts, 6 filed on September 4th by the Enforcement Bureau. 7 will just note that because I like to review what is 8 pending because sometimes I don't have everything. Is 9 there anything else that anybody else knows of that's 10 11 pending? MR. SHOOK: Not yet. 12 JUDGE STEINBERG: When Mr. Zawila entered 13 a notice of appearance on behalf of himself and the 1.4 other permittees and licensees, a couple of weeks ago, 15 he filed a request for continuance of the pre-hearing 16 date, it was denied. 17 And in that request, he referred to a 18 distress sale, possibility of selling I guess the 19 permits and the stations through a distress sale. And 20 I wondered if Ms. Sadowsky would address that. 21 22 MS. SADOWSKY: Yes, Your Honor. The

parties are pursuing with all seriousness the sale of these stations pursuant to the commission's distress sale policy. They have been in contact with counsel for qualified minority-controlled entities who have expressed interest. We are now also pursuing obtaining appraisals of the properties for purposes of pursuing the distress sale.

JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. I went back in my old files and looked up some of the ancient distress sale cases. Generally what happened was if a party elected to pursue a distress sale or explore a distress sale, generally the proceeding was stayed for a period of time to allow the party to do that and file -- once they found purchasers, and I guess most found purchasers -- to prepare the motion for petition for extraordinary relief and then get that to relevant distress sale, decision-makers, which in a fortunately, is not me.

I wondered if we could do that in this instance here, if we could just basically put the proceeding on hold. At least traditionally, at least the best I could determine, generally the proceeding

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would be stayed for five months. So what I would propose is basically staying the proceeding until February 9, 2004

Some judges would say, "Okay. Let's continue to do discovery, so that if the distress sale falls through or they don't find purchasers, then we can be ready to crank up and expedite the hearing."

Some said, "Let's put everything on hold because it doesn't make any sense spending the Bureau's time and money and the private parties' time and money doing what would ultimately become a useless act."

I think I am going to kind of split the baby. I would propose that we stay discovery to the extent of answering the requests for admissions of fact. If the Bureau wants to file or if Ms. Sadowsky wants to file discovery directed to the Bureau, what I am saying is you can file discovery requests during the stay period to get them filed, but you don't have to answer them until after February 9th.

But to sort of split the baby, I want to propose that any of the discovery requests that were

1.0

filed during the stay period, the responses be due on
February 23. In other words, you can file stuff but
really not have to do anything until the end of the
period if there is going to be no distress sale.

And I would expect, as an officer of the
court, if there isn't going to be a distress sale or
things fall through, that Ms. Sadowsky notify
everybody promptly so that maybe we can crank up

I mean, you could be moving on your discovery, and you can request documents. And you can ask interrogatories. And you've got the admission requests out. But Ms. Sadowsky doesn't have to waste her time and her clients' money responding to it until she knows there's not going to be a distress sale.

Does that make any sense, Mr. Shook?

And Ms. Sadowsky can do whatever discovery, file any discovery that she wants to put on the Bureau. But you don't have to do anything until she notifies you that there is not going to be a distress sale.

February 23rd gives everybody a couple of weeks. It just seems to make sense to me that you can

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N W WASHINGTON D C 20005-3701

again.

1 be doing something more useful than spinning your 2 wheels on a case that may never go to hearing. And if 3 it turns out February 23rd is not a good day or there 4 are just massive amounts of things, then we can 5 revisit that later. 6 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, there are two with respect to the renewal 7 aspects. First, applicant, it is the Bureau's understanding from the 8 allegations that appear in the HDO that there is a 9 possibility, perhaps a very reasonable possibility, 10 that that station's license should be forfeited 11 pursuant to 47 USC Section 312(q). In that sense --12 That's the 12-month JUDGE STEINBERG: 13 14 thing? MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir. And in that sense, 15 we have admissions requests relative to that station 16 that we are prepared to file tomorrow and would like 17 to get responses to. We would also like to get 18 responses to the admissions requests that we have 19 20 already filed. 21 That gets me to the second aspect of what

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I was going to say. And that is that while we

1	certainly understand from the motions that Mr. Zawila
2	hımself has filed and from Ms. Sadowsky's
3	representation this morning that there is a desire to
4	pursue distress sale relief and that some steps are
5	being taken toward that end, that until we actually
6	get in hand a petition for extraordinary relief which
7	details where they are and that they have done
8	something more than simply chat up a few people about
9	certain things, the Bureau would not sign on to a stay
10	at this point
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, I am going to
12	provide for status reports and detailed status reports
13	so that we both can be kept apprised of what is going
14	on.
15	My problem is I just think if there is
16	going to be a distress sale, it is a waste of time and
17	money to do the amount of work that it requires to do
18	discovery. And I think the time could be spent more
19	fruitfully doing things that are more useful.
20	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, it has been
21	brought to my attention

JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes?

MR. SHOOK: Excuse me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure.

MR. SHOOK: There was one other aspect that I forgot to mention, and perhaps this should be factored in here, and that is the processing freeze that is apparently now in place relative to assignment applications. And so long as that freeze is there, it that no application, no assignment seems to me application, whether it involves a distress sale or whether other run-of-the-mill ınvolves any ıt assignment, is going to be processed by the Media Bureau.

And so to that extent, we really can't get anywhere with distress sale --

JUDGE STEINBERG: Why should you hold everything up because of something none of us in this room -- I mean, that could go on for three years. Ms. Sadowsky could have a purchaser today and file her papers today. And you would say, "Let's go through discovery and go to a hearing because nobody can look at the papers." There might be court suits challenging the freeze. I mean, I'm not going to

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	editorialize.
2	MR. SHOOK· No. It's just one of these
3	things where I think that should be factored into Your
4	Honor's thinking and decision, because if it turns out
5	that this freeze holds, what we have, really, is an
6	ındefinite stay.
7	And in the meantime, Mr. Zawila, who has
8	been accused of a vast number of things, continues to
9	operate at stations, at least one of which perhaps the
10	license should be cancelled.
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, if the license
12	should be cancelled, maybe you should just go ahead
13	and cancel it.
14	MR. SHOOK: Well, we are in the hearing
15	setting now.
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: That is what has been
17	done in the past? Well, anyway, no. It has been done
18	in the past through the hearing setting.
19	MR. SHOOK: Now the problem has been
20	dropped into your lap.
21	JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes. Let me hear from
22	Ms. Sadowsky.

MS. SADOWSKY: Your Honor, I think your 1 2 proposal is reasonable. It would be more useful for 3 us to spend our time focusing on the distress sale 4 aspects, as opposed to answering discovery matters. 5 Quite frankly, I don't think the freeze really should have any bearing on this question. Ιf 6 7 you were to stay the discovery with the understanding 8 that if the distress sale doesn't go forward and require us to provide regular updates on our progress 9 toward the distress sale, it seems to me that come 10 February 23rd, if we haven't filed our petition for 11 extraordinary relief by February 9th, we will have 12 achieved what you would otherwise have set for dates 13 within the next -- I don't know how much time you 14 would give us for discovery in any event. 15 But I don't think we're losing that much 16 17 time --I've got a schedule JUDGE STEINBERG: 18 planned. 19 MS. SADOWSKY: I do think it would be 20  $2 \perp$ beneficial to both the Commission and our clients to 22 not have to waste their resources on discovery that

1	may not be necessary.
2	JUDGE STEINBERG: Mr. Cole 1s chomping at
3	the bit So I am going to use my discretion and let
4	him release all of
5	MR. COLE: Thank you, Your Honor. I
6	appreciate that.
7	As a preliminary matter, I think there is
8	an important question of law which Your Honor is
9	assuming, which I think you are making the wrong
10	assumption. That is that the distress sale still
11	exists.
12	JUDGE STEINBERG: I don't want to get into
13	that. I really don't want to get into that.
14	MR. COLE: But you can't avoid that if you
15	
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: Oh, yes, I can.
17	MR. COLE: if you are staying the
18	proceeding because of a distress sale policy which is
19	unconstitutional and has been so held.
20	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. I tried to do a
21	little research on it. Basically the decision as to
22	a distress sale, as to if a proposal for a distress

1	sale is made, I don't rule on it, thank the Lord.
2	That goes to, what, the Media Bureau to delegate. It
3	goes to somebody to delegate authority.
4	MR. SHOOK: In this case, it would go to
5	the Media Bureau.
6	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. To delegate
7	authority. I am going to let them deal with it, and
8	I am not going to deal with it. If the parties want
9	to pursue it, I will let them pursue it and let
10	somebody else have the responsibility for ruling on
11	that. I don't have it, and I don't want it.
12	So I am just assuming that, for purposes
13	of this proceeding, they can elect to do the distress
14	sale. Let somebody else rule on it as well.
15	MR. COLE: But you're ruling on it by
16	making that assumption.
17	JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, that's fine.
18	MR. COLE: You're making a threshold
19	assumption which delays this proceeding for at least
20	five months according to your schedule right now. And
21	that is assuming there is no slippage on the back end.
22	And my experience is there tends to be

1	slipperage on the back end, no matter
2	MS. SADOWSKY: Your Honor?
3	JUDGE STEINBERG: I'm willing to do it.
4	And to the extent that I am making a preliminary
5	ruling, if it's wrong, somebody will correct me down
6	the road. But this is the way I am going to pursue
7	this. I know your argument, and I don't want to
8	address it.
9	MR. COLE: It's a matter of
10	constitutionality, Your Honor.
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: Let the Media Bureau
12	handle it. And then you can maybe file a brief at the
13	time.
14	Was there anything else?
15	MR. COLE: The only other thing I would
16	have to say is that stretching this out until February
17	ıs fairly generous given the fact that the hearing
18	designation order was issued two months ago.
19	The party applicants and licensees have
20	been on notice for two months already of the issues
21	that the Commission has. Had they been interested in
22	pursuing a distress sale, they certainly have had a

Ĺ	two-month head start already. Giving them an
2	additional five months drags this out for seven
3	months.
4	JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, that's fine. I
5	presume from what Ms. Sadowsky said, steps have been
6	taken.
7	MS. SADOWSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
8	JUDGE STEINBERG: So maybe it hasn't been
9	a wasted two months.
10	I think what I am going to do is maybe
11	split the split baby and say that you can pursue
12	discovery with respect to is station KKFO the one
13	that you are talking about?
14	MR. SHOOK: That's the renewal applicant,
15	yes.
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: You can pursue discovery
17	with respect to station KKFO on the question of
18	whether they not broadcast for 12 continuous months.
19	Is that the
20	MR. SHOOK: Right. Well, Your Honor, we
21	would also request that, at the least, the admissions
22	request that we had made be answered so that we're in

7 a position to move quickly in the event that when 2 February rolls around, that we're still in the same 3 situation or position that we're in now. 4 JUDGE STEINBERG: Would you have any problem with that? 5 6 MS. SADOWSKY: Yes, Your Honor, I would. 7 We have five sets of requests for admissions and apparently something else coming down the pike with 8 respect to KKFO. 9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, sixth set. 10 MS. SADOWSKY: So just dealing with those 11 would require a substantial amount of time. 12 frankly, I don't think the Bureau would be prejudiced 13 if it received the information after we come to a 14 conclusion that a distress sale may not be possible. 15 I don't think that by having these admissions answered 16 on February 23rd, or received by February 23rd, that 17 the Bureau would be that further behind. 18 Essentially these requests are asking us 19 to admit everything that is alleged in the HDO. **Z** 0 21 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, yes, I kind of 22 noticed that.

MR. SHOOK: We tried to be thorough, Your Honor, but the point is that one of the points here is that should we delay to February and nothing definitive has happened, perhaps because the freeze, perhaps for some other reason, we are stretching out and perhaps losing evidence to fade, documents extent that memories seem τo disappear, people die.

We want the admissions answers relatively quickly so that we have a basis for going forward in the event the stay is lifted, for whatever reason, as opposed to finding out five months from now, seven months from now, God knows how many months from now, when the proceeding kicks back in, that Mr. Zawila, et al., are not in a position to answer those admissions because of things that have taken place in the interim.

They're in a position to answer these admissions now. They should be required to answer them now, not five, seven, ten months from now.

JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Let me hear from Ms. Sadowsky, please.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

SADOWSKY: 1 MS. Your Honor, I would 2 resterate that it would be an extreme, onerous burden 3 for these six parties to engage in answering discovery when they would like to pursue, they made it clear 4 they want to pursue a distress sale. 5 It seems to me that your proposal as 6 initially stated is one that is eminently reasonable and is not unfair to the Bureau in any stretch of the 8 9 1maginat1on and that we wıll not be substantial delay by going with the proposal that you 10 11 suggested originally. JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, I think I should 12 use my sense of humor and say just answer all the odd-13 numbered admissions requests and not the even-numbered 14 ones, but that would be too flip. 15 I think Mr. Shook persuaded me. 16 answer the admissions requests. And then that will be 17 it until the end of February -- not the end of 18 February, but if anybody wants to file additional 19 requests, including the one, KKFO -- that is going to 20 21 be filed shortly, you said?

MR. SHOOK: Right. And we need to give

1 That is going to be far more extensive notice now. 2 than the others because if you --3 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes. I know. MR. SHOOK: -- have read the HDO, you will 4 5 that there notice are lot allegations a more pertaining to that station than there are --6 7 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes. Why don't we just get finished with the admissions requests and then 8 9 from that point on, then discovery is stayed until And then if there is anything filed 10 February 9th 11 before then, then the due date will be February 23rd. 12 That way I quess the Bureau can get its And then if they want to file additional 13 answers. discovery and interrogatories, or notice people for 14 15 depositions and stuff like that, they can do it. And then everything will be in place by the end of 16 17 February to pursue. I think I am persuaded by Mr. Shook's 18 presentation about that things won't ever be fresher 19 20 their minds than they are today, the 21 respondents' minds.

MS. SADOWSKY: Your Honor, I might note

that each of the requests for admissions asks that 1 2 they be answered within ten days of service. We will 3 need more time than that provided. JUDGE STEINBERG: Why don't you and Mr. 4 5 Shook work that out? If you can't work it out, then come to me for a ruling. I'm sure you can work it 6 7 out, because they are rather extensive. 8 MR. SHOOK: We can be reasonable about that. 9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Now, on discovery 10 I've covered that. I just want to make a 11 -- okay. And that is if we do get into general statement. 12 wholesale discovery, I want everybody to make a good-13 14 faith attempt to work out your differences among yourselves, or between yourselves, depending. 15 A serious and genuine effort should be 16 made to reach a compromise with each other. Don't 17 come to me for a ruling on a discovery matter without 18 first trying to reach an agreement. 19 there is a complete inability to Ιf 20 21 compromise or reach any kind of accommodation, then 22 come to me. In this connection, any request for a

ruling on a discovery matter has to include 2 certification that counsel for the parties involved made a good-faith attempt to resolve the dispute but 3 couldn't do so. 4 5 I want status reports on the distress sale 6 possibility or the progress -- and I want them to be 7 fairly detailed -- to be filed by the permittees, licensees on November 10, 2003; January 9, 2004; and 8 then February 9, 2004 9 Ιf It basically gives you two months. 10 somebody thinks we should have more frequent reports, 11 let me know. Is that sufficient, do you think, Mr. 12 13 Shook? MR. SHOOK: That is sufficient. 14 My own thought, Your Honor, 15 MR. COLE: would be, at a minimum, we should have a written 16 status report now as to the precise nature of the 17 efforts that have been made and the time of those 18 efforts, we can get a start date for when things have 19 started to happen, and then go from there. 20 21 Now, whether or not November is adequate, 22 I leave it to Your Honor to decide. It does seem to

me to afford at this point another two months, again, 1 2 they have had two months already to start the process. 3 And theoretically we have a fairly 4 motivated seller here. If the stations or the facilities that you think you may have available for 5 sale are attractive, presumably there should be a 6 7 number of buyers out there. So it shouldn't take that 8 long to identify and get the process moving, to identify a buyer. 9 But I guess my immediate thought would be 10 11 to have an initial status report right now. JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, I'm satisfied with 12 Ms. Sadowsky's representation as to what has been 13 going on. I will just leave the status reports. ⊥4 more frequently 15 You can report something significant comes up, you know, "We found a 16 buyer for this station and wanted to let you know 17 early." You know, that would be nice, a nice 18 surprise. You can put it in with your Thanksgiving 19 cards. 20 21 Before we set a schedule, let me just talk 22 about the courtesy copies of pleadings. For some

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

reason, the mail system between the secretary's office and the Office of the Administrative Law Judges seems to have broken down. Many times we don't receive copies of pleadings, the letters, or other things that have been filed.

So I would ask the parties, counsel for the parties, to provide me with courtesy copies of all the pleadings and letters, et cetera, that you want me to see. Obviously if it's a pleading and I have to rule on it, it helps if I see it.

The Bureau usually on the day of filing has somebody hand-deliver a copy, a stamped copy, of the pleading to me. And that is great. If you could greatly that, that would be continue to do Counsel for Mr. Zawila and counsel for appreclated. Mr. Smith, if they become parties, if they could fax me courtesy copies of whatever they file after they have been stamped in so I can see the secretary's stamp or some other stamp on it, that might be the only copy I have with a stamp on it.

And, of course, things don't appear in the electronic comment filing, ACFS, electronic comment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	filing system. First, if they appear at all, they
2	don't appear promptly. And I really can't rely on it,
3	although I do go there, not in this case but in other
1	cases. I discover things that I never knew existed.
5	So it would be helpful if you could fax me
6	stuff with stamped copies of stuff. If it comes a day
7	or two later, fine. I don't care.
8	Let's go off the record, and I'll give you
9	my proposed schedule.
10	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
11	the record at 10:10 a.m. and went back on
12	the record at 10:17 a.m.)
13	JUDGE STEINBERG: We're back on the
14	record. While we were off the record, we agreed on
15	the following procedural dates. I am not going to
16	repeat the dates for the status reports, but that will
17	be part of the procedural schedule.
18	February 23, 2004 will be the date for the
19	responses to any outstanding or pending discovery
20	requests which were filed during the course of the
21	stay.
22	I Will point out that just because

February 23rd is the last date that these responses can be filed doesn't mean they can't be filed earlier or in due course. I pointed out that if counsel for the permittees and licensees perceive that there is not going to be a distress sale, then I would expect a good-faith effort be made to get the discovery responses in as quickly as possible; before February 23rd, if that is possible.

April 12, 2004 will be the date for completion of all discovery. And completion means that everything is scheduled to end on that date. It does not mean that the final request is filed on that date.

May 3, 2004 will be a date for the exchange of direct case exhibits; stipulations, if any; and the list of witnesses, if any, to be called for oral testimony. And all of them have to be received by everybody and by myself on that date. It's not a matter of putting them in the mail. That's the actual receipt date.

And then there will be a footnote in my order as to how I like the exhibits. And if there are

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE , N W

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ς,

1 any questions about how I like exhibits to be done, 2 just call me and ask me. 3 The important thing is that if you have a cover sheet on an exhibit, except for the cover sheet, 4 5 every page within the exhibit have a number on it. You start with number one, and then you end with the 6 7 number, whatever the last page is. The next exhibit, you start with number one, even if you have to write 8 them by hand and put them in little circles so that if 9 hearing, 10 we go to the just turn to 11 everybody's got the same page 12. The next date is May 10, 2004, the date 12 for desired 13 for notification of witnesses cross-examination. And the hearing will commence at 14 9:00 a.m. in probably this room in Washington, D.C. on 15 16 May 17, 2004. Do you have any problem with the 17 Okay. 18 dates, Mr. Shook? MR. SHOOK: No, Your Honor. 19 JUDGE STEINBERG: Ms. Sadowsky? 20 21 MS. SADOWSKY: No, Your Honor. 22 JUDGE STEINBERG: And Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Any --

MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, I do have one other matter to bring up, and that is one of the possibilities that flows from accurate admissions responses would be a summary decision motion, which would be certainly helpful to the Bureau in the sense that if it were properly framed and granted, that would reduce the number of issues that would have to be addressed during the hearing itself to make all of our lives much, much easier.

Would it be Your Honor's intention, should such a motion be prepared and filed, to delay ruling on that until this February period has passed? And so, instead of a discovery response being due on the 23rd -- and I guess the 9th is supposed to be the magic date in terms of whether or not the distress sale process actually gets off the ground.

If we're not at that point by February 9th, we have our motion on file at that point, that time would start to run for a response for Mr. Zawila, et al. So that Your Honor would be in a position to

1 rule on that perhaps as early as late February. 2 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, I think that's --3 gee, I never thought about the motion for summary 4 decision aspect of it. Yes, that's reasonable. you want to file a request for summary decision, then 5 the due date would be calculated from whenever we find 6 7 out -- if there's no distress sale, we will find out from the date we find out there is no distress sale or 8 February 9th or if you want to respond early, you can 9 10 respond early. What is it, two weeks, a summary 11 decision for an opposition? It's either 10 days or 14 MR. SHOOK: 12 I don't have it off the top of my head right 13 14 now. JUDGE STEINBERG: That seems reasonable. 15 MS. SADOWSKY. Your Honor? 16 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes? 17 MS. SADOWSKY. May I just ask a question 18 or make a comment with respect to the magic date of 19 20 I understand you are staving February 9? 21 proceeding through February 9th for purposes of our 22 allowing my clients to pursue a distress sale, but as

I understand the Commission's distress sale policy, if a distress sale is achieved prior to the hearing date at any time, for instance, there could be a possibility that even if we miss February 9th, that down the road before May 17th, we might file a petition for extraordinary relief at that time. And it would still be permissible under the Commission's policy.

JUDGE STEINBERG: I found some cases in my files which said that that wasn't -- I'm trying to remember -- that you can't come in like the morning before the hearing and say, "Okay. Here is the extraordinary relief," that there was some limitation to that. But I can't remember the details.

My intention, frankly, is that the petition for extraordinary relief be filed on or before February 9th. To this extent, I agree with Mr. Cole 100 percent that if you can't put together a distress sale and all the papers to accommodate it in seven months, it's fish or cut balt.

I mean, I am trying to be as reasonable as I can, realizing that there might be difficulties in

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N W

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2.

1 finding buyers for this number of stations or it might 2 be easy. MS. SADOWSKY: I understand. 3 My intention -- and 4 JUDGE STEINBERG: 5 maybe I didn't make it clear, and I'm sure I didn't 6 make it clear that -- my intention in setting the 7 February 9th date was that that's the date that I ordered, and that's the date that it's supposed to be 8 9 filed. I'm not suggesting that you cannot come to 10 me and say, "This is commission precedent. I can do 11 Then I would have to rule on that. 12 13 intention sitting here today is that February 9th date is sort of a drop-dead date and not just that you come 14 in with a final status report saying, "We have agreed 15 to everything, but February 9th is extraordinary 16 relief, petition for extraordinary relief, filing 17 date." 18 I mean, it has given you seven months. 19 MS. SADOWSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 21 JUDGE STEINBERG: And I wanted to give you 22 a lot of time. Okay. I think that clarifies it.

1	Anything else we have to talk about today?
2	MR. SHOOK: Nothing, Your Honor, nothing
3	on our agenda anyway.
4	JUDGE STEINBERG: Ms. Sadowsky?
5	MS. SADOWSKY: No, Your Honor.
6	JUDGE STEINBERG: Mr. Cole?
7	MR. COLE: Nothing, Your Honor. Thank
8	you.
9	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. If anybody needs
10	a conference for anything, please let me know. And if
11	I can't talk you out of it, I will schedule a
12	conference.
13	And it was great seeing everybody here
14	today. This is my social activity for the week,
15	unfortunately. Okay. We'll go off the record.
16	(Whereupon, at 10:25 a.m., the foregoing
17	matter was adjourned.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
2	

#### CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

William L. Zawila, et al
Name of Hearing
·) N· ()3-152
. t No. (if applicable)
St., S.W., Washington, DC
(← of Hearing
Cept nmber 9, 2003
f Hearing

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, imbers 1 through 37, inclusive, are the true, accurate and impose transcript prepared from the reporting by the Hendrixson in attendance at the above identified hearing, in a coordance with applicable provisions of the current Federal immunications Commission's professional verbatim reporting and in inscription statement of Work and have verified the accuracy of the incuracy of the transcript by (1) comparing the typewritten incurrent against the reporting or recording accomplished at the maxings and (2) comparing the final proofed typewritten inscript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearing or conference.

9/10/03	The M Hendren
1,1 E	Legible Name and Signature of Reporter  Name of Company: New Gross Co
,	
4/10/03	Dawk Veach
nate -	Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber Name of Company: New 671055 (
	Name of Company: New Griss (3
9/10/03	Matthew W Needham
late	Legible Name and Signature of Proofreader Name of Company: May R. Gross Co.
	rame of company. May 17, 01833 Ca.